

² Defendants' objections were due by August 8, 2022, and Plaintiff's objections were due by August 11, 2022. See ECF Nos. 82 & 83.

Magistrate Judge’s recommendations. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199–200 (4th Cir. 1983). The Court reviews only for clear error in the absence of an objection. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation’” (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note)).

Having found no clear error, the Court **ADOPTS** the Magistrate Judge’s R & R [ECF No. 83], **GRANTS** Defendants Dixon, Scott, and Whitaker’s motion for summary judgment [ECF No. 40], **GRANTS** Defendant Thomas’s motion for summary judgment [ECF No. 41], **DISMISSES** this action *with prejudice*, and **DIRECTS** the Clerk to close this case.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Florence, South Carolina
August 29, 2022

s/ R. Bryan Harwell
R. Bryan Harwell
Chief United States District Judge